

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 22, 2003

LB 759

certain buildings on certain...serving certain constituencies, maybe the mentally ill, education, whatever you want to talk about it, we could certainly earmark these funds. The reason the funds get earmarked is because it's hard to find general revenue for a lot of these purposes, and because, as Senator Beutler said, that particular constituency that's successful in getting an earmark can kind of guarantee it for a long period of time, unless someone comes back and tries to get it repealed. So it's kind of an artificial appropriations process that's set up without General Fund money. So I've decided that I'm not totally opposed to the concept of taking the earmarks away and letting it go through the appropriation process, at least for the next couple of years, while we're in this budget crisis, and that it is more of a sense of prioritization, as Senator Quandahl has said. Maybe it is more appropriate in this budget crisis to take the earmarks off and send the Appropriations Committee back and have them decide what would be there in terms of priorities. Now, that's going to sound like kind of an odd thing, coming from someone who chairs a committee that gets and earmark, and that's our Building Maintenance Fund, has an earmark. It's one of the few sources of...one of the only sources of revenue it has. But I guess I would feel confident, when that is weighed against what the needs of the state are, that the Legislature would find that we need to fund the repair of these buildings, and that even if the earmark is lifted, that probably that revenue would be redirected. I can't say that for all the other funds. But I would think that...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR THOMPSON: ...not everything, if the earmarks were taken off, would go away necessarily. I don't think Game and Parks would be in a situation where they wouldn't be able to fix up some of the things that they need to have addressed in the next few years. I'm not sure all of the earmarks would stay. But I think a revisitation of them isn't, maybe, a bad thing. So I'm going to listen to the debate on this, and try to keep an open mind. And maybe it's not appropriate. Maybe it is. But this is...these are uncertain times, and they're unusual times, as a Legislature, when we have to look back at some of those decisions we've made. In the Appropriations Committee, we